

## REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of 5 Apr 2004 of Examiner James H. Blackwell.

claims 1-21 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

### *Specification*

Applicants have amended the specification provide serial numbers of related and copending, previously filed applications.

### *35 U.S.C. 112*

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 13, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for the improper use of trademarks.

The Examiner is correct, and applicants have amended these claims to remove the use of trademarks from them.

**35 U.S.C. 103**

**Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Courter et al. "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition, Copyright 1999 (hereinafter Courter).**

The copy of Courter provided by the Examiner was illegible. Applicants response to Courter is based, therefore, primarily on their understanding of the Microsoft Office.

As well as Applicants can determine, Courter is based on typical Office technology. A primary distinction between Applicants' invention and Office is with respect to the manner in which documents are imported, edited and saved again.

In Office, Windows Explorer is used to access the local file system, and collaborative space is added as an element inside Explorer. To save a file, the user goes to FILE/SAVE AS, and drills down.

Applicants' invention works in the rendered view of the information in the browser whereas in Courtner the information is brought into the desktop.

In accordance with this aspect of Applicants' invention, a user opens a web browser, navigates to the url of the QuickPlace (collaboration place), selects (clicks on) the folder in which the document is to be placed, clicks NEW or IMPORT, and then is provided the option to bring in a file from the file system by clicking on the browse button (ActiveX control). This brings in the file open (not file save) dialog. The user can then select the file on the local windows file system to add to the collaborative space.

This is inverse of Windows. In Windows the user has a document and determines (SAVE AS) where to put it. In Applicants invention, the user enters (goes to, opens) a place in collaboration space and then selects the document to bring into that space.

Thus, Courter is using the Windows file system view (Explorer, etc.) to navigate collaboration space. Applicants use the browser. Courter doesn't appear to describe the UI of his collaborative space, but does seem to

illustrate how to put things in it from Office and Windows. Conversely, Applicants invention is how one works inside of collaborative space and brings content into it from the file system. The task flows of Courter and Applicants are different in this regard.

In Applicants method, unlike Courter, the creation of the HTML file is done automatically upon completing and importing a document. (See Specification, page 146, line 16.)

Applicants have amended independent claim 1, and thereby dependent claims 2-3, to clarify these distinctions with respect to Courter.

With respect to claims 1-3, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertion, at page 4, lines 1-5, that "it would have been obvious... to have placed each of the two file types in said modes because it would have allowed for a side-by-side comparison of the formatted file (html file in read mode) and the source (document file in edit mode). Applicants are not aware that such has ever been done, and it would appear that the Examiner is drawing upon some personal knowledge of which applications are not aware.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse this allegation, as "the teaching or suggestion... and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure." In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Applicant respectfully assert that such an allegation is impermissible hindsight on the part of the Examiner. To reach a conclusion of obviousness under § 103, the Examiner must produce a factual basis supported by a teaching in a prior art reference or shown to be common knowledge of unquestionable demonstration.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertion, at page 4 line 21 to page 5 line 2, that "it would have been obvious... to have used drag and drop providing the benefit of not having had to use the two step process of cut and paste to move a document file from one place to another." Using drag and drop to move text is not like using drag and drop to move a file into collaboration space on a browser from the file system. Applicant respectfully assert that such an allegation is impermissible hindsight on the part of the Examiner. To reach a conclusion of obviousness under § 103, the Examiner must produce a factual basis supported by a teaching in a

prior art reference or shown to be common knowledge of unquestionable demonstration.

Claims 4-7, 17, 19, and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Courter in view of Salas et al. (U.S. Patent 6,233,600, hereafter Salas) and Blumberg (U.S. Patent 6,708,309).

Applicants traverse.

Salas does not describe html renderings of content that is imported into collaboration space. Salas does deal with the structure of collaboration space, and discusses using html files in network environment (col. 1, background) - but does not to mechanisms for rendering documents that are brought into the space. Salas, at Col. 2, 2nd paragraph - looks similar but is not: Salas is actually describing a rendering of the structure of the information, not making the documents in that structure readable within that rendering.

On the other hand, Applicants' invention is about automatically generating (neither Courter or Salas teach such) or embedding a rendering of the document imported from

the desktop in the rendered view of the workspace. Applicants embed a rendering of a desktop content automatically generated and displayed in an embedded region of the rendering of the workspace. Navigation of workspace involves seeing links to folders and rooms in workspace: this is rendered along side a view of the document.

Courter, Salas or Blumberg may describe the ability of user to drag MS office content into shared workspace, but none teaches the essential additional step that only Applicants do: as a consequence of that action automatically generate an html rendering of the document that can be/is displayed in workspace in context of navigational elements and other functions of collaboration space. By embedding a rendering of the document in the workspace applicants only can add collaborative function in the context of that rendering.

Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertion, at page 6 lines 10-13, and at page 8, lines 12-15, page 9, lines 16-20, page 12, lines 16-19, and page 18, lines 11-15, that "it would have been obvious... to combine the teachings of Courter, Salas, and Blumberg providing the benefit of having allowed an author to collaborate on a document with the

option of having previewed it from a browser." There is no suggestion of such in any of Courter, Salas, or Blumberg, but only in Applicants' own specification. To reach a conclusion of obviousness under § 103, the Examiner must produce a factual basis supported by a teaching in a prior art reference or shown to be common knowledge of unquestionable demonstration. Applicant respectfully traverses this allegation, as "the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure." In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Applicant respectfully assert that such an allegation is impermissible hindsight on the part of the Examiner.

**Claims 8-9, and 20, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Salas in view of Blumberg.**

Applicants have amended these claims to clarify distinctions with respect to Salas and Blumberg as previously discussed.

Further, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertion, at page 11, lines 2-6 that "it would have been obvious... to



combine the teachings of Salas, and Blumberg providing the benefit of having a convenient user interface for uploading documents and having made them available via a browser for preview by collaborators." There is no suggestion of such in any of Courter, Salas, or Blumberg, but only in Applicants' own specification. To reach a conclusion of obviousness under § 103, the Examiner must produce a factual basis supported by a teaching in a prior art reference or shown to be common knowledge of unquestionable demonstration. Applicants respectfully traverse this allegation, as "the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure." In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Applicants respectfully assert that such an allegation is impermissible hindsight on the part of the Examiner.

**Claims 10-16 have been rejected over Salas in view of Blumberg and Courter.**

Claims 10-16 depend back to claim 8, which has been previously discussed with respect to Salas and Blumberg, and which has also been amended to clarify distinctions with

respect to Courter, Salas and Blumberg.

In Applicants invention, as claimed, one of the modes of the upload control allows multiple documents to be upload as a batched series of documents that are automatically inserted into the site. When the user does import into the browser rendition of the collaboration space, there are many modes in the upload control from which he can choose. One mode (attachment mode) is that the user can use the upload control to add attachments by drag/drop, or select a number of documents that will be added to a box at bottom of page. Another mode (import mode), allows the user to import individual document, dragging them to the upload control or picking them from a file dialog, and several document are automatically converted to html and composited for rendition in the place.

While this is taught and claimed by Applicants, it is not suggested by any of Salas, Blumberg, or Courter.

Therefore, Applicants traverse the several assertions of obviousness at page 13, lines 5-7 and 17-19, page 14 lines 8-10 and 18-22, page 15, line 21 to page 16, line 2 and lines 12-15, and page 17, lines 4-7. In each instance

the Examiner asserts the obviousness of claimed elements without identifying a teaching in a prior art reference or shown to be common knowledge of unquestionable demonstration. Applicants respectfully assert that such an allegation is impermissible hindsight on the part of the Examiner.

**Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Salas in view of Blumberg.**

Claim 18 has been amended, and as amended distinguishes Salas in view of Blumberg as previously discussed. Further, as previously discussed, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertion of obviousness at page 18.

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-21.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should

differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

P. J. Shaughnessy, et al.

By

  
Shelley M Beckstrand  
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 5 August 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.  
Attorney at Law

61 Glenmont Road  
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972  
Fax: (276) 238-1545